

REMARKS

Claims 1, 17, and 23 have been amended leaving claims 1-23 pending in the application.

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

Claim 1, line 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: “the second surface” lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

The applicant has amended claim 1 to correct a typographical error.

Claims 17, 18, 20, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hayashi et al.

Hayashi et al disclose conductive segments (32), two conductive legs (32c, 32d), a first end (32a), a second end (32b) (as best shown in Fig 12).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Amended claim 17 is directed to a method for making connections to a *power converter*. Amended claim 17 recites, among other things, “**providing a power converter** having electrical contacts arranged on a first surface, the converter having a bottom surface below the first surface, a border of the bottom surface being inset from a border of the first surface; and interposing between the contacts and the substrate, conductive segments that comprise two generally parallel conductive legs, each leg comprising a first end and a second end, the first ends of the two legs being connected to one or more of the electrical contacts and the second ends extending to a location below the bottom surface and connecting to one of more of the pads.”

Hayashi discloses mounting a hybrid IC 1 to a surface of a printed circuit board 5. Hayashi fails to teach or suggest providing a power converter, much less “providing a power converter having electrical contacts arranged on a first surface, the converter having a bottom surface below the first surface, a border of the bottom surface being inset from a border of the first surface” as recited in claim 17. Claim 17 is patentable for at least this reason.

Dependent claims 18-20 depend from and incorporate the features of independent claim 17 discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Amended claim 23 incorporates the features of allowed claim 2 from which it depends and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 1-16, 21, 22 are allowed.

Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

Applicant : Patrizio Vinciarelli et al.
Serial No. : 10/714,323
Filed : November 14, 2003
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 00614-141001 / Connector

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the examiner for indicating that claims 1-16, 21, and 22 are allowed and that claim 19 contains allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the references cited in the November 5, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement (which crossed in the mail with the November 5th Office Action) and return of the initialed PTO Form 1449 to the undersigned attorney.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050 referencing attorney docket no. 00614-141001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/1/05



Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906